

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_99426
Title of the Manuscript:	Readiness of Users of the Covid-19 Reporting System (Allrecord) at the Semarang City Referral Hospital with the Technology Readiness Index
Type of the Article	Case study

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The article is relevant, has a scientific and practical novelty, is recommended for publication and can be published after revision. 2. Yes 3. The summary reflects the content of the article. 4. Yes 5. It is not indicated on the basis of which research methods the article contains/do not contain reliable/inaccurate results. 6. An adequate modern list of references was used. References to literary sources included in the text.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It's the job of the editor.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Malykhin Fedor T.
Department, University & Country	Stavropol State Medical University, Russia